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**ABSTRACT**

This study aimed at investigating the effectiveness of using Some Online-Collaborative Learning Tools (Google Docs and Padlet) to develop student teachers' EFL creative writing skills and writing self-efficacy. The study followed a pre-post experimental one group design. The participants were 36 second year students enrolled in English Language section, Faculty of Education, Benha University. To determine the most important and required EFL creative writing skills for the participants, a checklist of EFL creative writing skills was developed and validated. A pre-post EFL creative writing skills test and writing self-efficacy scale were prepared. Students were pre-tested, to identify their entry level of EFL creative writing skills and their writing self-efficacy beliefs. Then, they were trained through the suggested online collaboration-based program on how to develop their creative writing skills (fluency, accuracy, flexibility and originality) and the main dimensions of writing self-efficacy and trained adequately through its main three phases (preparation, practice and evaluation). The post-test was applied to the participants to assess the progress in their level of performance in EFL creative writing skills and writing self-efficacy. Findings of the study revealed that there was statistically a significant difference at 0.01 in the pre- and post-assessment of EFL creative writing skills and writing self-efficacy in favour of the post-assessment.
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**Introduction:**

In language teaching and learning, we need both creative teachers and students in order to increase the level of success and motivation. However, creativity research in foreign language is unfortunately rare, especially in writing context. As a skill, writing is considered to be the most difficult to improve and students have a resistance system towards writing. Many students give up before starting to write or they postpone it as much as possible because writing is taught as a mechanical skill and this causes fatigue, decrease in motivation and failure.

Creativity concerns with novelty and originality. Creative writing is directly associated with creativity. It means one's putting his feelings and ideas about a particular topic on paper using imagination freely. Creative writing involves going beyond the ordinary without deviation from the normal values, creating ideas that are different from everyone else's ideas with the help of one's imagination, achieving originality and writing fluently while taking pleasure in the act of composing (Oral,2012). In the same vein, Marshall(2004) assured that creative writing is characterized by originality and imagination rather than truthfulness or standardization of thoughts. It requires organization, planning and discovery of thoughts, and rejects the restrained thinking.

Rippey (2014) asserted that creative writing is an enabling and inspiring learning activity for EFL learners. EFL students display a natural affinity for creative writing activities. These activities offer language learners an array of distinctive opportunities and enable them to be involved in a process of self-exploration, self-discovery and self-expression. These gains bring benefits to motivation and self- confidence. As a result, the EFL syllabi entered an era in which creative writing and other imaginative language learning and research should be flourished. Everett (2005) indicated that a further role for creative writing in English: beyond assisting and enabling learning, it can also provide alternative ways of expressing and demonstrating learning.

Developing students' creative writing skills serves as an aid to the acquisition of certain aspects of the language (particularly grammar and vocabulary) and addresses the development of communicative competence. This is because EFL learners should move beyond the beginner stage of acquisition through multiple motivated tasks.( Smith, 2013). Creative writing on the other hand can help to teach how to behave creatively in their lives (Sternberg, 2009). Eckhoff and Urbach, (2008) asserted that children’s imagination and creativity are somewhat advanced but components of an educational environment can either sustain or stifle children’s imaginative abilities. Creative writing gives opportunity to students to choose their own writing subjects and methods.

Teaching creative writing – that is, encouraging students to write by drawing upon their imagination and other creative processes – may support writing development in all its components (Barbot, Tan, Randi, Donato & Grigorenko, 2012). Moochi, Barasa & Ipara(2013) stated that there are many sub skills of creative writing that the students should practice while writing such as :cohesion and coherence, appropriate adequate structure, fluency and flexibility of thoughts and correct spelling and right punctuation.

So, there are many benefits of creative writing in EFL classes. It creates a pleasant and supportive atmosphere in the classroom. It offers rewards in a motivational manner through the development of group cohesiveness, and makes learning more stimulating and enjoyable as it breaks the monotony of classroom events and increase the attractiveness of tasks through enlisting them as active task participants. Consequently, it builds learners' self-efficacy and confidence through providing encouragement and promoting cooperation among learners (Donnelly,2009;Ramet, 2007 & Dornyei,2005)

 The significance of emotional dimensions in language learning and their positive or negative contribution to success have been studied by scholars in quest of reaching firm conclusions on factors influencing learning despite the elusive nature of psychological aspects ) Doğan,2016). EFL learners’ self-efficacy played an important role in English language learning and is usually considered as critical factor affecting their English language proficiency. The concept of self-efficacy was first introduced by Bandura in 1970s. It is defined as learners’ confidence in one’s ability to complete academic tasks (Bandura, 1997; Pajares, 1996; Zimmerman, 2000)

Self-efficacy, which is one of the most influential psychological factors in people’s life, plays a dominant role in identifying goals and accomplishing them. Nevertheless, for some people putting these plans into action is not so simple. Self-efficacy beliefs determine how people feel, think, motivate themselves and behave. According to Bandura (1994), people with a strong sense of self-efficacy feel that they can master challenging tasks, devote themselves to their interests and activities and digress easily from disappointments by heightening and sustaining their efforts in the face of failure. Such an efficacious outlook produces personal accomplishments, reduces stress and lowers vulnerability to depression.

Bandura states four sources of self-efficacy as; achieving progress in a task, seeing people similar to oneself succeeded by effort, being encouraged by others in a positive way to overcome self-doubt and emotional states and physical reactions as well as stress levels. People who judge themselves as efficacious in managing potential threats neither fear nor shun them. However, if people’s reaction to a challenging task is not adequately strong to overcome its negative impact, it may weaken self-efficacy (Bandura, 1989). When people are dissatisfied with their personal efficacy, they quickly abandon the skills they have been taught. They view threats anxiously and avoid them. Those who lack confidence in their academic skills envision a low grade before they even begin an exam or enroll in a course, which is critical especially at the high school and university levels (Pajares, 2005).

In writing, however, a strong sense of self-confidence in the writing task is called writing self-efficacy. In other words, individuals may feel better to write when they have self-belief or self-confidence in their ability to write. They may also be more assertive and face with the difficulties with more perseverance when doing a writing task. In the self-efficacy discussions, three degrees of efficacy are mentioned: high, mid and low. Those who have a high confidence in the writing ability are considered as people with high self-efficacy or having a positive sense of self when it comes to writing. The definition for the other types are in the same direction. So, the students with high self-efficacy consider the hard writing task as a challenge to fulfill and try their best to accomplish the task by making productive use of their cognitive strategies (Lavelle, 2006). Conversely, non-self-regulated students don’t get involved in learning process and as a result they might be subjected to any kind of sophomoric knowledge rather than deep knowledge which is needed for high academic achievement (Zimmerman, 1986).

Theories of collaborative learning are based on the socio-constructivist theory that information is socially created by communities of people which individuals will gain knowledge if they be a part of knowledge communities (Vygotsky, 1978). Thus, learning happens as learners improve their knowledge through collaboration and information sharing in authentic contexts. Vygotsky (1978) asserted that language and culture play essential roles in human collaboration and communication. As a result, the socio-constructivist learning theory is basically a collaborative learning theory. In education, collaborative learning is seen as a process of peer interaction that's mediated and structured by the teacher or lecturer.

Collaborative learning takes on a variety of forms in an active process including the utilization of technology as a medium and tool. collaborative learning activities, particularly once supported by collaborative technology are credited with various benefits. This benefit can roughly be classified into 2 broad categories; social benefits and academic benefits. As within the social benefit, students find out how to manage and require the emotional. the students have reported feeling of greater inclusion and reduced isolation. the students additionally describe the increase the engagement and motivation. so in cluster, the similarity of target project needs a same motivation and intimacy to complete the assignment. (Rahayu, 2016:227).

The literature review has mentioned various advantages of collaborative learning. Collaboration among students is an interesting alternative in terms of creating helpful and active learning environments (Suwantarathip & Wichadee, 2014). Through the process of collaborative writing, students are able to recognize the value of cooperation and learn to be aware of their contributions to teamwork achievement. Google docs is a popular collaborative writing tool which is part of a free, web-based software office suite offered by Google within its Google Drive service. The suite allows users to create and edit documents online while collaborating with other users in real-time. It allows for a quick and comfortable information flow between group members.

Google Docs is free browser-based software offered by Google providing applications including a word processor, a spreadsheet, a presentation package and a form designer (Firth & Mesureur, 2010). Google Docs gives students a way to publish and share their work (Yamauchi, 2009). Jacobs and Seow (2014) provided an example of using Google Docs with a group of students collaboratively writing a research report. After the students had finished their individual research, they shared their draft in Google Docs so that every student could view the document and had an equal opportunity to comment or edit the shared document. As they worked together on the report, peer interactions were facilitated, and as a result, higher order thinking skills were stimulated.

The ability to share and edit documents between group members makes collaboration much easier (Chiu,Wang, Popescu, Li & Lau, 2014, p.150). Google Docs allows students to share a draft via email or Google Docs, where they can instantly edit and provide and this in turn saves them from completely rewriting their drafts (Curtis, 2013). Google Docs also expunges issues of geographical boundaries, making it easier to work from any location in the world. The comments in Google Docs also encourage students to reply to their teachers and peers’ comments, thus increasing their motivation (Al-Chibani, 2016). This sharing of experiences in an asymmetric manner until creation of the final product, works to keep the motivation levels of students’ high (Mitnik, Recabarren, Nussbaum, & Soto, 2009; Suwantarathip & Wichadee, 2014).

 Google docs have captured a prominent place as the most potent collaborative tools that have been widely used in collaborate Projects in EFL/ ESL settings. (Dekeyser and Watson, 2006; Raftery, 2011; Yang, 2010). Google documents are one of the best web-based applications which help users to share their documents written in different file formats. Also, it has a remarkable impact on developing user collaboration, connection, and production over the web in asynchronous computer-mediated communication. In teaching English language settings, Google Docs provide EFL students with ample opportunities for editing their work and receiving constructive feedback. (Hardison (2012). Seyyedrezaie, Ghonsooly, Shahriari, & Fatemi, in their study conducted in 2016 have consolidated the reality that Google Docs have a significant and incredible contribution to develop EFL writing productivity through collaboration. Moreover, EFL students could be involved in collaborative work with students from all over the world. Using such tools enable students to share their writing productions with their peers and teachers to collaborate on the editing process

Google Docs is a free web-based tool offered by Google that combines features of word processor and spreadsheet, presentation, form, and data storage service (Suwantarathip & Wichadee, 2014). It enables users to create, edit and store their documents online (Thompson, 2008). Meanwhile, it provides an extensive revision history of document edition which can help users to view documents as it appears over a time. An author can choose to revert to an earlier version. The Google Docs application permits access from any personal computer (PC) and facilitates the capacity to work together by offering a report to others as watchers or associates, or by distributing it on the web (Conner, 2008). Sharp (2009) construes that the collaborative editing tools allow for collective editing of a document simultaneously by individuals while they can see the changes made by others in real time. This special feature of Google Docs makes ‘a powerful program’ that can aid collaborative writing especially, in the language learning classes. It is important as the learners can share documents and keep them online, that can be accessed anytime.

Furthermore, Google Docs helps to implement the learner-centered approach in a collaborative learning environment. In the same token to Wikis, Google Docs empowers collaborative learning which allows for peer editing of documents an archive composed by different users, and by proposing changes through remark composing, without altering with the content of the document (Suwantarathip & Wichadee, 2014 & Alkhataba, Abdul-Hamid, & Bashir, 2018). As Oxnevad (2013) states that document sharing using Google Docs provide students with opportunities to receive immediate feedback. Meanwhile, learners can collaboratively create online materials that reflect what they have learned previously and their current learning experience by demonstrating associations between their previous knowledge, the course content, and their own encounters.

Google Docs, as an online collaborative writing tool, allows applicants to edit their writings synchronously and collaborate with each other, and has the potential features to be applied in the writing classroom (Chu, Kennedy, & Mak, 2009). In his study, Hardison (2012) mentioned that Google Docs, as a beneficial tool, helps EFL teachers to inspire students to express their ideas freely and comment on their peers’ writing for improvement. Also, the finding of Spinuzzi’s (2007) study revealed that the features of Google Doc are suitable for cooperative activities because it provides students with opportunities to see their peers’ work and write collaboratively. Moreover, the findings of Blau and Caspi’s (2009) study indicated that their students had positive attitude towards writing collaboratively rather than writing individually in an online environment.

One unique feature in Google Docs is its ability for contributors on a document to leave feedback. Zheng, et al., (2015) note that Google Docs provides the ability to leave *Comments* and *Suggestions* in the margins of documents, allowing students to interact more quickly and conveniently than if they were writing on paper or using other word-processing programs. The research shows that these comments and suggestions can be beneficial for both the students giving the feedback and the students receiving the feedback.

EFL teachers can use Google Docs (GD) in developing EFL writing skills for a number of reasons. First, GD enables teachers to monitor students’ progress. Because all the writing occurs online and drafts are saved on students’ Gmail accounts, teachers do not have to formally collect the students’ drafts (Kessler, Bikowski, & Boggs, 2012). Second, teacher comments and peer feedback are also automatically saved, similar to the Microsoft Word format. Most importantly, dates for each revision, editing, and teacher feedback are saved, and the document is automatically updated (Kim, 2009). Third, students Novice users of GD can learn about it by browsing through https://sites.google.com/site/docsforesl/home, a website created by Firth and Mesureur (2010), who continue to maintain it. This website includes useful tutorials featuring GD and an array of GD-mediated activities. can do most of their work electronically; thus it creates convenience because students do not have to carry a hardcopy draft, save the draft on a jump/USB drive, or send the updated draft to their emails after making changes (Zhou, Simpson, & Domizi, 2012). Fourth, it promotes collaborative learning by allowing students to share a document to work on a course project and to chat online at the same time in order to negotiate, contributing to the development of the project (Rowe, Bozalek, & Frantz, 2013). GD has some untapped potential for L2 writing classrooms and offers ways to enhance computer-assisted writing instruction.

With technology learning and teaching activity can be done everywhere and every time as long as there are devices and internet connection. Technology also can be integrated with teaching and learning activity in the classroom. One of the technology that can support learning and teaching activity in the classroom is Padlet.

 Istianah,2019) Additionally, Padlet reflects the premises of social constructivism, a theory which suggests that learning is realized through social interactions among learners as Pritchard and Woollard (2010) discuss. The origins of social constructivism derive from Vygotsky’s Constructivism (Bouniol, 2004) which also emphasizes the significance of social interaction in FL acquisition. Thus, learners are active members who share authority and co-construct knowledge socially. Padlet can contribute to building a virtual classroom community (Zainal, & Deni 2015 ), as it enables learners to connect and interact. This feature echoes Wenger’s (1998) notion of Community of Practice, a theory that regards learning as a process that occurs through social participation, as learners interact regularly, because they share a common goal. Padlet is a communication platform that provides learners with the space to engage in discussions and activities of a common interest or purpose

Padlet (https://padlet.com) is an online board that Byrne (2015) & Shield, (2014) identified "Padlet" as one of the collaborative research tools that is a free-of-charge service allowing the creation of online pages of shared notes, videos, and documents. Using Padlet in classroom learning increases the cooperation and collaboration among students, who can access the virtual walls anywhere and anytime. Kaya, (2015 ) asserted that Padlet is a great place for gathering ideas, sharing them and modifying them later Creating. Both teachers and students can use to express their thoughts or to post content on the page. Sangeetha, (2016) clarified Padlet is a virtual wall that allows people to express their thoughts on a common topic easily. It works like an online sheet of paper where people can post any content (e.g. images, videos, documents, text) anywhere on the page, together with anyone, from any device. This is a device-agnostic tool, available on the web but also available as both an Android and iOS app. It Encourages creativity among students in order to create, collect ideas, images, quotes, and more in an "idea bin". Padlet is a virtual writer's journal or design notebook to collect ideas, images, and even video clips.

According to Sangeetha (2016), these are the step to use Padlet : Go to http://padlet.com/ and click on Sign up if you want to make an account or Log in if you already have an account There are some ways to make an account on Padlet. One of them is using Google, Face book, or Microsoft account. Another way to make an account is using email. You also can use your email to sign up. After someone sign up on Padlet, there will be a page to choose membership. Finishing sign up and membership plan, Padlet can be started. There will be choices to start on Padlet . To make a new Padlet wall, a user can use blank page or use template which are already provided there. From now on, a user can modifies and sets up her/his own wall. The action that can be done in modifying a wall include giving a name or title, giving a description, and choosing background image. Next action is setting-up user's privacy. There will be some option which can be chosen by a user in setting-up her/his privacy as shown in After setting-up privacy, a user can start posting on her/his blank wall. A user can embed a link, video, file document, or image on her/his posting. Some action such as remaking, sharing, and editing of posting can be done if necessary

Teacher can use Padlet in order to enhance the interest of the students in writing class by asking them to do an active learning activity on Padlet. Teacher starts the lesson by posting a certain topic on Padlet, and then the teacher asks the students to give their opinions about the topic or answer some questions. Students have to respond the topic that is given by their teacher and post the responds on Padlet. After the students post their opinions or answer some questions on Padlet, teacher can ask the students to comment on their peers’ post. By commenting on the other posts, students will get feedback from their peers. Padlet is a good media to collaborate real-time in a virtual environment (Algraini, 2014).

Regarding education, it has to be stressed that it provides a safe and protected environment for students. Once the instructors sign up for an account with Google, Facebook or email address, and create a new Padlet, they can control the content of the wall and monitor all the member activity by customizing the privacy settings. In other words, a Padlet wall can be secret or private, which means that it is not visible in Google search, while the teacher, can set a password and provide the link only to students. Simultaneously, teachers can control what learners write, view, or moderate on the wall and check the material before it is pinned (Zainal, 2015& Deni ), since they can choose the kind of the access the participants will have; ranging from reading only to moderating. Last but not least, the word-processing features that Paldet entails eases the writing process since learners can avoid spelling and grammar mistakes while editing their texts (Hyland, 2003). Moreover, Padlet offers the chance to learners to share their thoughts and feelings, since it creates an effective and joyful environment in which students can exchange educative information (Awaludin et al., 2017).

Padlet has shown significance in improving writing where the platform gives an opportunity to share students’ assignments and receive feedbacks. Students can post their own work and instantly they give some contents such as comments, feedback, opinions, and additional information about a topic which is explaining in group discussion. Students will share the contents with their lecturers. Using Padlet to improve English writing can control and plan students confident to develop their own writing and to have more enthusiasm for learning language through technology (Wiangsima, 2013). Sign in up for an account will be beneficial for teachers as their can manage their classroom interaction and performance. An email will be sent to notify the teacher each time a student responded to the teacher's wall (Wood, 2016). Additionally, Lestari’s (2017) study revealed that learners writing competence was improved, as they practiced sentence and paragraph writing and enriched their vocabulary. In the same vein, Awaludin et al. (2017) also mentioned in their study that learners improved their vocabulary independently by reading their friends’ posts.

The results from Jabar & Ali’s (2016, p.167) research pointed out that students’ motivation for language learning is increased especially because their Padlets were viewed by their classmates and their work was completed “collaboratively and creatively in a highly enjoyable and stimulating environment”. Peer feedback is a crucial factor in raising learners’ motivation. On the same ground, Septina (2015) stressed that Padlet increased the learners’ motivation towards writing through peer evaluation, while it improved their performance; while DeWitt et al. (2015) found that Padlet raised learners’ participation in discussions as it allowed them to experience authentic communication with a real audience, that is, their peers

Moreover, MunirahHaris et al. (2017) state that Padlet integration helped learners to improve their grammar, while Stannard (2015) highlighted its effectiveness as a tool that facilitates project work, class discussion, and brainstorming. Similarly, Lysunets & Bogoryad (2015) concluded that Padlet is a versatile online interactive tool that boosts learners creativity and enthusiasm in collecting and sharing ideas. Therefore, Padlet can be really useful in the brainstorming stage of assignment writing as learners give their opinions about their classmate's ideas. Their study also stressed that the stage of peer feedback was also facilitated, since learners can freely express their viewpoints by posting their comments. As a result, learners’ self-confidence and autonomy in learning are promoted.

In conclusion, it can be concluded that using online collaboration learning tools can be used to develop EFL creative writing , learner motivation, positive performance and their self-efficacy dimensions.

**2. Context and Statement of the Problem:**

In spite of the importance of the creative writing skills and self efficacy, there is a lack in them among second year students enrolled in English language section , Faculty of Education, Benha University.

 Out of the present study researcher's experience in teaching at the university level, she noticed that second year students enrolled in the English section encounter difficulties in EFL creative writing skills. They cannot write a good paragraph that contains indicators of creative writing skills (fluency, flexibility, accuracy and originality).

 Concerning the Egyptian context, most current Egyptian English language programs do not provide students with opportunities to practice EFL creative writing skills in the communicative context. Previous researchers proved that EFL students face some writing problems. Those problems might hinder their ability to express themselves freely, as they are not interested in the topic that the teacher asks them to write about. They cannot link sentences into a coherent paragraph, nor can they express their thought in a logical and organized way. Moreover, the absence of motivating and self efficacy dimensions in the pre-writing activities that can allow learners to gather adequate ideas and information essential for writing or the lack of appropriate time and attention devoted to developing.(Abdelbary 2016; Abdelrahman, 2017; Elbehery, 2013; Eldoda, 2016; ElHadidy, 2018; Elnagar, 2016; Ibnian, 2009; Ibrahim, 2017; Matar, 2017; Salman, 2018; Zeidan, 2016)

 To document the problem of the present study, a pilot study was conducted by the researcher to identify the creative writing skills among second year students enrolled in the English language section. The participants were 20 students of the second year enrolled in the English language section, Faculty of Education, Benha University. The pilot study consisted of two tests: an EFL creative writing test adopted from Elbehery, (2013) and EFL self efficacy scale from Erkan,(2013). What weakens the student’s paragraph is poor topic sentence, poor support points, and poor related examples. A topic sentence is not effective because it lacks appropriate controlling idea, asks a question, makes an announcement, and is a fragment. The support points are not effective because the writer student leaves out important key words, changes key words, and adds other inappropriate information to them, and combines them with the related examples. The related examples are not effective because they are not discussed one at a time, lack minor transitional expressions, and do not have specific details to make them lively and convincing. they know the words they want to use, but they do not know how to

spell the words correctly students often write sentence in wrong structure (grammatical errors); Moreover, they ignore capitalization and punctuation.

The findings of the pilot study revealed that there is a low level of second year students' creative writing skills and self efficacy, so this research proposes a program based on "OCLT" for developing EFL creative writing skills and self efficacy among second year students enrolled in the English language section at the Faculty of Education, Benha University.

**3. Questions of The Study**

To face this problem, the present research attempted to answer the following questions:

1. What are the features of the suggested program based on online collaborative learning tools "OCLT" ?
2. What is the effectiveness of using online collaborative learning tools for developing the second year student ' EFL creative writing skills?
3. What is the effectiveness of using online collaborative learning tools for developing the second year student ' EFL self-efficacy?

**4. Review of Related Studies**

Online collaborative learning and teaching platforms such as Google Docs or padlet can enhance communication, participation and collabora­tion in the language classrooms and help learners to participate in more meaningful and authentic learn­ing activities. Since the new pedagogical model for technology-enhanced English writing basically encour­ages online participation and collaboration, this instructional model leads to a new form of social interaction (Dastjerdi,2016). As a result, peer feedback or peer-editing in English writing instruction has become one of the most powerful classroom techniques, which enable learner-empowered learning. Over the last several years, online collaborative technologies have gained much popularity among educators to enhance their teaching and learning environments and EFL creative writing skills and its indicators as follows:

Yu-Fen and Shan-Pi (2011) found that one successful strategy involved the teacher showing students a first and second draft of the same piece of writing, which can be accomplished through Google’s Revision History, in order to illustrate how the edits improved the work. This strategy by the teacher might help students understand how much editing and revising can truly help them, even though they might think they are done after a first draft (Yu-Fen & Shan-Pi, 2011). Both of these strategies use Google technology to help teachers improve the writing process for students.

According to Oxnevad (2013), document sharing and comments provide students with opportunities to receive immediate feedback. While working together, students generate online materials that reflect what they have learned and show connections between their prior knowledge, the course content, and their personal experiences. Since Google Docs is stored online, students can work at school and at home from any computer with an Internet connection, and they are more likely to revisit their work if they know someone else will be commenting on it. To insert a comment, students just highlight some text in the body of the document and the comment will appear on the right side of the page. Then they can click on any comment and watch the highlighted text in the document change color to quickly pinpoint the suggested revision. Comments are smart and they disappear after the issue has been addressed by the author so students feel a sense of accomplishment as they work their way through the suggestions of their peers. In addition, Google Docs provides support for collaboration in real time so students and teachers can have a virtual mini-conference about the work in front of them from any location if the timing is right

Suwantarathip & Wichadee (2014) in their study compared writing abilities of students who collaborated on writing assignments using Google Docs with those working in groups in a face-to face classroom. The experimental research was conducted with students enrolled in EN 012 course in the first semester of academic year of 2013. Both groups were assigned to complete four writing assignments using different working methods: one group worked together outside class with Google Docs, while the other worked together in class. The instruments employed in the study were writing tests and two questionnaires. Data were analyzed by using means, standard deviations, percentages, and independent samples t-tests. The results indicate that a significant difference was found between the two groups’ writing mean score after the experiment. Students in the Google Docs group gained higher mean scores than those working in groups in a face-to-face classroom. In addition, students reported that they had positive attitudes toward collaborative writing activity and high collaboration in their groups using Google Docs, while nearly all of them perceived that this learning tool is easy to use.

Seyyedrezaie, Ghonsooly, Shahriari, & Fatemi, (2016) in their study investigated the effect of writing process in Google Docs environment on Iranian EFL learners’ writing performance. It also examined students’ perceptions towards the effects of Google Docs and their perceived causes of success or failure in writing performance. In this regard, 48 EFL students were chosen based on their IELTs writing test scores. During the treatment, the students were taught how to write a formal five paragraph essay in the class, but they were supposed to practice writing process and give feedback to their peers’ essays through Google Docs. At the end of the treatment phase, the participants received another sample of IELTs writing test (posttest). Moreover, 20 participants were interviewed for their perceptions regarding the causes for their success and failure and the influence of Google Docs on their writing performance. The analysis of a Paired-Sample t-test revealed that Google Docs played an effective role in improving students’ writing performance. In addition, the analysis of interview revealed that the students perceived both internal and external causes for their success and failure; but in case of failure, internal factors were cited more often than external ones. Also, it was revealed that students generally showed positive attitude towards the implication of Google Docs as a factor leading to success in their writing performance.

Marandi, & Seyyedrezaie (2017) in their study examined the differential effects of the Google Drive integrated writing instruction (blended writing instruction) and face-to-face writing instruction on the writing performance and writing apprehension of EFL learners. The participants of the present study were 84 EFL students chosen out of 107 students based on their IELTS writing test scores. The students were randomly assigned into two groups (Google Drive integrated group/face-to-face group). Then, Writing Apprehension Test (WAT) was administered as a pretest to all students in order to measure their level of writing apprehension. During the treatment, the participants wrote fourteen essays which were assessed by their peers. Finally, another IELTS writing test and Writing Apprehension Test (WAT) were administered to evaluate the students’ writing performance and level of writing apprehension after receiving instruction. The results of an independent sample t-test revealed that the learners of Google Drive integrated group outperformed in writing post-test than those in face-to-face group. Also, the analysis of another independent sample t-test revealed that face-to-face learners had higher level of writing apprehension compared with Google Drive learners.

Khalil, (2018) in his study is an attempt to elicit students’ responses prior to using Google Applications namely Google Docs (a web-based application allowing for documents to be written, edited, and stored online) and Google Classroom (a web service which enables teachers to create, share, and evaluate assignments within a paperless environment) in their grammar course and after doing so for the purpose of finding out the effectiveness of such applications in building a collaborative learning environment and adhering to the principles of a flipped classroom. Data was elicited from six EFL university students taking a Grammar I course at Palestine Ahliya University in Bethlehem via pre and post-questionnaires as well as a semi-structured interview. The findings of the study suggest that according to the students, Google Applications help establish a collaborative learning environment since they support teacher-to-student and student-to-student interactions and the majority of the participants prefer using such applications for future courses given that they can benefit from the availability of teacher

written feedback and the easy access to course materials.

Yeh, & Chen, (2019) in their study investigated the communication process and attitudes of a group of college students toward collaborative writing using a *Google Docs* app on an English writing course. Online collaborative writing assignments were assigned by the instructor in class, while the English as a foreign language (EFL) students were required to work on the writing assignments online. The researchers examined participants’ peer negotiations in this mobile-enhanced, collaborative writing project, focusing on these EFL learners’ negotiation discourse patterns and strategies. With the aid of mobile technology, participants practiced English writing in a collaborative way. Their discourse functions, peer negotiation strategies, attitudes, and learning experiences were investigated. A mixed methodology was applied. The findings revealed that participants had a generally positive attitude toward the collaborative writing experience. The results are also discussed in terms of learners’ peer negotiation strategies and types of discourse functions.

Algraini (2014) in his research investigated the effect of using Padlet to enhance female Saudi EFL learners‘ writing performance. It is conducted in the first semester of the acdemic year 2014/2015. The sample is taken from 24 students who were randomly selected and were studying in the fifth level. The result of the research shows that Padlet was very effective in improving the participants‘ writing skills.

In their study, Zainal and Deni (2015) found that Padlet supported the formation of virtual communities that promoted peer learning and evaluation in a safe web-place while learners increased their knowledge, since they were allowed to visit other web pages and finally view their input directly. Additionally, Ellis’ (2015) supported that the use of Padlet increased learners’ interest, while students were more willing to contribute to the class discussion via Padlet than verbally.

Haris, Melor, & Bandusah, (2017) focused on the effectiveness of using Padlet in improving students' learning in English grammar. The participants of the research consist of 30 students at University Sains Islam Malaysia. The data is collected by the means of pre-post test and questionnaire survey. The result of pre-post test indicate that there is significant improvement in students‘ performance. The result of questionnaire survey also shows high preference and participants‘ positive attitude towards using Padlet as means for learning grammar. The differences between the research and this research are the number and the level of participants and the focus of the research. The research participants are 30 university students and focus on the use of Padlet toward grammar mastery. The participants of this research are 36 of vocational high school students. This research focus on using Padlet application as a media to improve writing skills.

Gasmi and Thomas (2017) utilized Padlet within a flipped, academic, EFL writing course and observed its effects on learning. The authors posted digital course content pertinent to “theoretical aspects of academic writing" on a padlet (Gasmi & Thomas, 2017, p.239). Results cited students were more "cognitively engaged" with the learning material, and both participants and instructors “utilized several deep learning strategies to cope with the demands of this teaching approach" .The results indicated the potential of Padlet for promoting peer-collaboration and ameliorating interest among students in the ESL/EFL classroom.

Ali, Malek, Abidin, & Razali, (2018) in their study investigates the use of Web 2.0 in assisting tertiary students in their writing. Four (4) types of Web 2.0 tools namely Edmodo, YouTube, Prezi and Padlet were employed to assist students in writing essays. The study uses mixed-method research design where quantitative data were gathered through student performance in a pretest and posttest of a writing test. For qualitative data, students’ responses pertaining to their perceptions of using YouTube, Prezi and Padlet were collected from their remarks made in ‘Type a reply’ in Edmodo. The results showed that there was a significant increase in students’ pre and post writing tests while students demonstrated positive perceptions in the use YouTube, Prezi and Padlet and can be sources or tools for teaching and learning writing via online.

Lestari and Kurniawan (2018) investigated the use of Padlet as a media to improve student's descriptive text writing mastery. The object of the research is the third semester students of English department of UNISKA Kediri. The participants of the research consist of 20 students. The result of the research shows that 18 from 20 students passed the minimum score. This means the implementation of Padlet as a media can improve students' writing mastery.

Rashid, Yunus, & Wahi, (2019). in their study investigated how collaborative writing in a language course could be enhanced by the use of an interactive on-line tool called Padlet. 87 participants taking a language course in a public university in Malaysia were involved in the research. The study was aimed to improve language and communication skills, increase motivation, lower anxiety and encourage students to become more autonomous. A series of tasks were designed using Padlet and carried out through the semester. Student’s posts and feedback in the form of a questionnaire were analyzed. The findings showed that Padlet motivates students to participate in class activities, lower anxiety, encourages interaction among class members and instructor, and improves language accuracy through learning from peers. Padlet could be effectively used in an undergraduate course to facilitate collaborative writing among lower proficiency ESL learners.

**5. Hypotheses of the Study:**

 In the light of the review of literature and related studies, the following hypotheses are formulated:

1- There is a statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the participants in the pre- and post-assessment of EFL writing fluency in favour of the post-assessment ."

2- There is a statistically significant difference between the participants' mean scores in the pre- and post-assessment of EFL writing flexibility in favour of the post-assessment."

3- There is a statistically significant difference between the participants' mean scores in the pre- and post-assessment of EFL writing accuracy in favour of the post-assessment ."

4- There is a statistically significant difference between the participants' mean scores in the pre- and post-assessment of EFL writing originality in favour of the post-assessment ."

5- There is a statistically significant difference between the participants' mean scores of the in the pre- and post-assessment of overall EFL creative writing skills in favour of the post- assessment.

6- There is a statistically significant difference between the participants' mean scores in the pre- and post-assessment of self-efficacy in favour of the post-assessment ."

**6- Methodology of the study**

This part of the research sheds the light on the research methodology that has been followed in investigating the effectiveness of using some online collaborative learning tools (OCLT) in developing EFL creative writing skills and self-efficacy among second year English section, Faculty of Education, Benha university. The methodology includes the following points:

1. Participants of the study
2. Research design
3. Instruments and Materials of the study

A- The EFL creative writing skills Test .

B- The EFL Self-Efficacy Scale.

C- The suggested (OCLT) -based program.

**1- Participants of the study:**

The participants of the present study consisted of 36 second year English language section students at Faculty of Education, Benha University during the second semester of the academic year 2018-2019.

**2- Design of the study:**

The present study is mainly quantitative. Its design is quasi-experimental which is based on manipulating the independent variable and measuring its effectiveness on the dependent variable (Torchin, 2003:29). The experimental one group pre-test and post-test design was used to investigate the effectiveness of using the online collaborative learning tools (OCLT) Based program in developing EFL creative writing skills and self efficacy among second year English language section students at Faculty of Education, Benha University.

**3- Instruments of the study:**

This study aimed at using some online collaborative learning tools (OCLT) for developing EFL creative writing skills and self-efficacy among second year English language section students at Faculty of Education, Benha University. The following instruments and materials were developed by the present study researcher to fulfill the purpose of the present study :

1. An EFL pre-post creative writing skills test .
2. An EFL self efficacy scale adopted from Erkan,(2013).

 C. The (OCLT) -based program

**A- EFL Creative Writing Test:(pre-post test)**

TheEFL creative writing skills test was developed by the present study researcher. The test has four parts, each part was developed to measure one of the intended skills (fluency, flexibility, accuracy and originality).The first part focused on assessing the fluency skills and the students are required to generate as many related ideas as possible, then choose two of these ideas and write a paragraph about it. The second part focused on assessing flexibility in which , students are required to restate a paragraph on his own . The third part focused on the accuracy indicators, where students were required to paragraph that contains some errors (spelling, grammar, vocabulary, and punctuation), find these errors and correct them. Then the final part of the test assessed students' originality in ideas. in which students were required to **solve a specific problem with a unique solutions.**

**- Piloting and scoring the EFL creative writing Skills Test:**

The EFL creative writing skills test was administered to a pilot sample of 30 second year English language section students at Faculty of Education, Benha University to investigate: (1) clarity of instructions; (2) suitability of the language level to the sample; (3) comprehensibility of test items and to make sure that the questions were understood by students and to allocate the time required for responding to the test different sections. No problems were reported with clarity and comprehensibility. Regarding time allocation, the researcher calculated the mean time spent by the first and the last learner to complete the test . The section appropriate time was about 15 minutes for each one (one hour).The test was assessed by using a rubric designed by the researcher. It consists of four parts. Each of the these four dimensions consisted of a four point rating system, so that the range of the scores would be from four to sixteen.

**-Validity of the EFL Creative writing skills test :**

 To estimate the **face validity**, the EFL creative writing skills test was submitted to 5 jury members in TEFL (**Appendix A**). They were asked to express their opinions regarding the clarity , the difficulty level and length of the test, and how far each item measures the skill intended to measure. The jury members reported the appropriateness of the test items to the skills to be measured. Suitability of the test to students' academic level was reported. Clarity of the test instructions and questions and representation of the targeted skills were also reported. For the final form, see **Appendix (B**).

 In order to estimate the **construct validity** of the EFL creative writing skills test, the correlation coefficient was calculated between the total score for each dimension of the four parts of the test and the total score of the whole test by using the Statistical Package for Social Science software (SPSS) version 18. The correlation coefficient and the significance level are presented in table (1).

**Table 1 :The Construct validity of the EFL creative writing skills test**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Level of Significance** | **Correlation Coefficient** | **Test Dimensions** |
| 0.01 | .76 | Fluency |
| 0.01 | .78 | Flexibility |
| 0.01 | .72 | Accuracy |
| 0.01 | .75 | Originality |

According to this table, the correlation coefficient for the EFL creative writing skills test was statistically significant at 0.01 for the four parts of the test. Therefore, the test was internally consistent and valid.

**- Reliability** **of** **The** **EFL creative writing Skills Test :**

For estimating the reliability of The EFL creative writing skills test, the researcher used the test-retest method. The test was administered to a random sample of second year English language section students at Faculty of Education, Benha University, (n=30). The test was administered again to the same group after two weeks. The Pearson correlationcoefficient between the two administrations was 0.81 which is statistically significant at 0.01.

**B - EFL Self-Efficacy Scale:**

 The researcher adopted Erkan (2013) self-efficacy Scale. Based on the self-efficacy construct proposed by Bandura (1977), Erkan developed a 21-item writing self-efficacy scale to determine the strength of participants’ belief in their writing ability before and after the intervention (Appendix C). This questionnaire required individuals to rate their confidence in writing English-language compositions. There is no right answer for any statement. The best answer is what they see. Items are statments to which students' responses are (1= I cannot do it at all , 2 = I can’t do it well , 3 = I can do it, 4 = I can do it very well ).

Based on its robust psychometric properties, the scale was deemed a reliable and valid tool for assessing self-efficacy in foreign-language writing. The 21 items in the scale were divided into subscales that probed student’s beliefs about different elements of writing skill. Five items focused on ability to provide the ***content*** requested for a composition, five focused on ability to ***design*** a composition, five focused on ability to create a ***unified*** composition, four focused on ***accuracy*** of the composition, and two focused on ability to ***punctuate*** correctly.

The writing-efficacy scale was administered to all 36 subjects prior to and after the intervention in order to track changes in students’ self-beliefs about writing in English.

**The** **Validity** **of** **The** **EFL Self-Efficacy Scale:**

To estimate the Self-efficacy scale validity, the clarity of items and the suitability of the scale items to the students' level and background, the scale was submitted to five Jury members . Some changes to some items that not related to students have been modified . The jury members asserted that the test items were valid.

 **The** **Reliability** **of** **The** **EFL self-Efficacy scale:**

 The scale was piloted on a random sample of second year, English language section, Faculty of Education, Benha University (n= 30) during the first semester of the academic year (2018-2019). Then, the scale was administered again to the same group after two weeks . The Pearson correlationcoefficient between the two administrations was .802 which is statistically significant at 0.01. This means that the scale is reliable**.**

**C- The suggested (OCLT) -based program:**

The **(OCLT) -based program** was developed to enhance EFL creative writing skills and self-efficacy of second year students enrolled in English language section at Benha Faculty of Education and providing them with some theoretical knowledge about EFL creative writing skills (**fluency, flexibility, accuracy and originality**) and dimensions of self-efficacy and how to practice them to the mastery level of acquiring them **( See Appendix D)**

**a- Objectives of the program:**

The **(OCLT) -based program** was developed to develop EFL creative writing skills and self-efficacy of second year students enrolled in English language section ,Faculty of Education at Benha University.

The researcher used diversity of activities and tasks through the sessions to enable the participants accomplish the program objectives . By the end of the program, students will be able to :

* memorize the importance of (OCLT) in general and in language learning in particular .
* acquire the importance of EFL creative writing skills and self- efficacy to them as English language learners .
* develop the creative writing sub-skills( fluency, flexibility, accuracy and originality)
* Enhance student' s self-efficacy dimensions and motivation by actively promoting learner autonomy .
* Make learning more stimulating and enjoyable by breaking the monotony of classroom events.

**b- Content of the program:**

The program included EFL creative writing skills and self-efficacy activities and tasks that were suitable for second year students, English section, Faculty of Education, at Benha University and adopted from various sources such as :  [Craig](https://www.google.com/search?tbm=bks&tbm=bks&q=inauthor:%22Jennifer+Lynn+Craig%22&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwits7yz2M7jAhUDMewKHYRaDbkQ9AgIXDAH),2012; Disney - 2014; Everett, (2005).; Harmer,(2007) and Temizkan, (2011).

**Description and Framework of the program:**

The program consisted of 15 sessions. The first two were orientation sessions about online collaboration learning tools used in the program, the sub-skills of EFL creative writing skills and self-efficacy and the importance of this skill to the study sample. The rest sessions were instructional ones through which the EFL creative writing skills were practiced (fluency, flexibility, accuracy and originality). Moreover, there were two sessions for revision. Each one of the revisions session was practiced and presented after the total practice of its skill, as a kind of formative assessment for the program**. ( See Appendix D)**

**Table 7. The (OCLT) -Based Program framework**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Session& Date** | **Objectives** | **Materials** | **Duration** |
| **Pre-test session** | ***Pre-test of EFL creative writing test and self-efficacy scale*** | **Handouts** | **120 minutes** |
| **Session one****Goal Setting****&****Introduction** | **1**-know what is meant by (OCLT) andits strategies, goals, bases and why it is important for them**.** **2**-know the importance of EFL creative writing skills  | - Students' handouts of session ( 1)- PowerPointPresentation. | 90 minutes |
| **Session two****Goals Setting& Introduction (2)** | **1**- Acquire the creative writing sub-skills (fluency, flexibility, accuracy and originality)2- Identify the importance of acquiring of self-efficacy dimensions | - PowerPointPresentation.- Students' handouts- Internet access and Laptop  | 90 minutes(One hour and half) |
| **Session three****(Fluency) 1** | 1- Develop their ability to generate a large number of ideas 2- Express the meaning with different word groups. | - PowerPointPresentation.- Students' handouts - Internet access and Laptop | 90 minutes |
| **Session Four****(fluency) 2** | *1- use different sentences and vocabulary to express the meaning.* | - PowerPointPresentation.- Students handouts - Internet access and Laptop | 90 minutes(One hour and half) |
| **Session Five****(fluency 3)** | 1- use transition words properly to show the logical sequence of related ideas.2- write a coherent paragraphs through means of coherence techniques. | - PowerPointPresentation.- Students' handouts - Internet access and Laptop | 90 minutes(One hour and half) |
| **Session Six****(flexibility 1)** | **1-develop their ability to generate flow of ideas in different ways****2- Express others' ideas on his/her own words** | - Students' handouts **-** PowerPointPresentation.- Internet access and Laptop | 90 minutes (One hour and half) |
| **Session seven****( Flexibility 2)** | 1- Use different linguistic patterns.2- Develop their ability to create different aspects of language independently | - Students' handouts - PowerPointPresentation.- Internet access and Laptop | 90 minutes |
| **Session Eight****(Flexibility 3)** | 1- develop their ability to change their point of view and redefining problems by making concrete and abstract ideas when necessary. | - Students' handouts - PowerPointPresentation.- Internet access and Laptop | 90 minutes |
| **Session Nine****(Accuracy 1)** | 1- Develop their writing without errors( grammar , structure, punctuation and capitalization. | - Students' handouts of unit nine- PowerPointPresentation. | 90 minutes |
| **Session Ten****( Accuracy 2)** | 1- use grammar correctly and sentence structure. | **-** Students' handouts **-** - Internet access and Laptop | 90 minutes |
| **Session Eleven****(Accuracy 3)** | 1- Use appropriate and precise word choice. | **-** Students' handouts - Internet access and Laptop | 90 minutes |
| **Session Twelve****(Originality 1)** | 1- The ability to generate a truly unique ideas or unexpected ideas | **-** students' handouts- Internet access and Laptop**-** PowerPointPresentation. | 60 minutes |
| **Session****Thirteen****(Originality 2)** | .1- Write imaginative ideas from different points of view | **-** students' handouts**-** PowerPointPresentation- Internet access and Laptop. | 90 minutes |
| **Session Fourteen****(Originality 3)** | 1- compose a short story with a suitable title( introductory paragraph of the story, topic of the short story and ending paragraph for the short story | **-** students' handouts**-** PowerPointPresentation.- Internet access and Laptop | 90 minutes |
| **Session Fifteen****(Revision)** | Revision on EFL Creative writing skills sessions | **-** students handouts**-** PowerPointPresentation. | 90 minutes |
| **Session****(post-assessment)** | Post- assessment of EFL creative writing test and self-efficacy scale | - Internet access and Laptop | 60 minutes |

**Procedures of the program:**

The present study was conducted among 36 second year students ,English section , Faculty of Education at Benha University during the second academic year of 2018–2019. The program goes through certain steps as follows:

- The study was carried out following several, systematic stages with the tasks performed by the instructor and the students in each stage. At the first stage, the students were informed of the purpose of sessions as part of assessment of their performance in EFL creative writing that should be done in pairs. They were also informed of the purpose of Google Docs and Padlet implementation . The preparation stage starts from the previous meeting. First, the lecturer informed the students that they will use the Google Docs for their next meeting. In accessing Google Docs students should create a Google account first because Google Docs is a part of Google. In creating Google account students need computer with Internet connection. Second, students have to open web page https://accounts.google.com and then enter the username, password

- The second stage involved training the learners on how to use Google Docs for group writing and editing as well as instructing them on how to search and download research papers from the Google Scholar. At the pre-writing stage, each pair of the students had to select three articles in one specific research topic in the area of EFL language acquisition and learning and teaching. They also summarized them by writing notes and then planning the structure of their paragraphs to write their first draft. During this stage, the instructor also provided them with a sample paragraph and instructed them on the various elements of its parts.

- All aspects of writing can be revised through padlet and Google docs . There are the aspects of writing content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics. Moreover, Google Docs and padlet tracks all the changes and tags each edit with the responsible Google account holder's name. It means that, all of the group members will know who writes, revises, and edits the text in the document. Furthermore, the participants also can do chatting with all of group member. The students just click the **comment** box to chat with others if the students do not agree about other members opinion about ideas of writing. This process is done in this step until the paragraph is considered good enough to be published.

- The researcher created a Padlet wall and invited learners to connect. In the pre-writing stage, the learners have to brainstorm about the places that they will suggest and collect ideas. Participants browsed the internet to pin photos, videos, articles, or other links that are related to the task on the wall. In this way, background schemata and related vocabulary are activated, while the information is pinned for future reference, when they have to write their paragraphs.

- The writing stage involved the learners in each pair in organizing and developing their thoughts, ideas and summaries into first drafts of their reports. This was followed the instructor setting up the Google Docs groups and sharing each group with its respective learners through email. Each pair of students had to upload their first draft of report writing in their Google Docs page. The Google Docs feedback and peer editing sessions started from 15 February to 30 May 2018.

- During this stage, the learners received corrective feedback through Google Docs comments from the instructor and peers. In each pair, the two students received feedback from the instructor and each one provided and received feedback from the other peer. They also had to read the feedback and draft their writing several times by adding, removing, replacing, ordering and correcting errors and issues in their reports till reaching the final version that was read again by the instructor and approved as the last version to be printed out and submitted for assessment. Google Docs had made the efficiency learning time increase

- At this stage, the learners and the instructor were present online for two hours a week (Saturday evening) for feedback and peer editing. However, due to the time restriction of the weekly scheduled sessions, the learners were allowed to work on editing at any other time during the week that suits them. This generated more feedback and multiple drafts and changes to text.

-In the evaluation stage, each group showed their final version of writing to others by using projector in the class. Other group can read the paragraph and see what edits or changes the group has made and who has made the changes. Finally, the researcher assesses the final version of group writing. Once the document has been assessed, it can be published by selecting the “Publish to the Web” option under the “Share” drop-down menu. The document can be accessed and seen by anyone anywhere in the world.

-Participants also expressed their sense of comfort while working on their assignments manuscript under the close supervision of the researcher. According to them, the use of Google Docs and padlet for editing, organizing, and revising their paragraphs creates an anxiety-free environment and boosts their confidence and productivity as a creative writer. Moreover, they tend to be motivated as they experienced new methods and sophisticated platform for writing. Hence, they put more effort in developing their creative writing skills.

**7- Findings of the study:**

To measure the effectiveness of the (OCLT) program, the participants were pre-tested on the EFL creative writing skills and post-tested. They were also, tested on the EFL pre- and post-self- efficacy scale. For comparing the initial and the final mean scores of the participants in the overall EFL creative writing skills and self-efficacy to find whether there was statistically significant difference between them in the pre- and the post- assessment , the researcher used the one sample T-test, as it is the suitable design of the study treatment. The findings of the study are given below with the hypotheses of the study as follows:

**- Findings of the first hypothesis:**

The first hypothesis states that "there is a statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the participants in the pre- and post-assessment of EFL writing fluency skills in favour of the post-assessment ."

 For testing this hypothesis, the one sample T-test was used to compare the mean scores of the participants in EFL writing fluency skills on the pre- and the post administration of EFL creative writing test. Table (3) presents the mean scores, standard deviation and level of the significance in the pre- and post-assessment of the EFL writing fluency skills.

**Table 3 : T-test differences between the participants' mean scores in the pre- and post-assessment of EFL writing fluency skills .**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Skill** | **Assessment** | **N.** | **Mean** | **S.D.** | **T-Value** | **D.F** | **Sig.** |
| **Writing fluency** | **Pre-** | **36** | **7.055** | **1.452** | **16.823** | **35** | **0.01** |
| **Post-** | **36** | **10.277** | **1.344** |

 This table shows that the mean scores are **7.055** for the pre-assessment and **10.277** for the post-assessment. The standard deviation (S.D.) is **1.452** for the pre-assessment and **1.344** for the post-assessment. As shown in the Table (8) the first hypothesis was accepted**.** ", where t= **16.823**, p<0.01 which is statistically significant at 0.01.

**4.1.2. Findings of the second hypothesis:**

The second hypothesis states that "there is a statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the participants in the pre- and post-assessment of EFL writing flexibility skills in favour of the post-assessment ."

 For testing this hypothesis, the one sample T-test was used to compare the mean scores of the participants in EFL writing flexibility skills on the pre- and the post administration of EFL creative writing test. Table (4) presents the mean scores, standard deviation and level of the significance in the pre- and post-assessment of the EFL writing flexibility skills.

**Table 4 : T-test differences between the participants' mean scores in the pre- and post-assessment of EFL writing flexibility skills .**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Skill** | **Assessment** | **N.** | **Mean** | **S.D.** | **T-Value** | **D.F** | **Sig.** |
| **Writing flexibility** | **Pre-** | **36** | **7.277** | **1.322** | **10.841** | **35** | **0.01** |
| **Post-** | **36** | **9.777** | **. 9590** |

 This table shows that the mean scores are **7.277** for the pre-assessment and **9.777** for the post-assessment. The standard deviation (S.D.) is **1.322** for the pre-assessment and **0.959** for the post-assessment. As shown in the Table (4) the first hypothesis was accepted**.** ", where t= **10.841**, p<0.01 which is statistically significant at 0.01.

**4.1.2. Findings of the third hypothesis:**

The third hypothesis states that "there is a statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the participants in the pre- and post-assessment of EFL writing accuracy skills in favour of the post-assessment ."

 For testing this hypothesis, the one sample T-test was used to compare the mean scores of the participants in EFL writing accuracy skills on the pre- and the post administration of EFL creative writing test. Table (5) presents the mean scores, standard deviation and level of the significance in the pre- and post-assessment of the EFL writing accuracy skills.

**Table 5 : T-test differences between the participants' mean scores in the pre- and post-assessment of EFL writing accuracy skills .**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Skill** | **Assessment** | **N.** | **Mean** | **S.D.** | **T-Value** | **D.F** | **Sig.** |
| **Writing accuracy** | **Pre-** | **36** | **7.861** | **1.854** | **7.165** | **35** | **0.01** |
| **Post-** | **36** | **10.888** | **2.039** |

 This table shows that the mean scores are **7.861** for the pre-assessment and **10.888** for the post-assessment. The standard deviation (S.D.) is **1.854** for the pre-assessment and **2.039** for the post-assessment. As shown in the Table (5) the first hypothesis was accepted**.** ", where t= **7.165**, p<0.01 which is statistically significant at 0.01.

**4.1.2. Findings of the fourth hypothesis:**

The fourth hypothesis states that "there is a statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the participants in the pre- and post-assessment of EFL writing originality skills in favour of the post-assessment ."

 For testing this hypothesis, the one sample T-test was used to compare the mean scores of the participants in EFL writing originality skills on the pre- and the post administration of EFL creative writing test. Table (6) presents the mean scores, standard deviation and level of the significance in the pre- and post-assessment of the EFL writing originality skills.

**Table 6: T-test differences between the participants' mean scores in the pre- and post-assessment of EFL writing originality skills .**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Skill** | **Assessment** | **N.** | **Mean** | **S.D.** | **T-Value** | **D.F** | **Sig.** |
| **Writing originality** | **Pre-** | **36** | **7.305** | **1.305** | **10.273** | **35** | **0.01** |
| **Post-** | **36** | **9.777** | **1.607** |

 This table shows that the mean scores are **7.305** for the pre-assessment and **9.777** for the post-assessment. The standard deviation (S.D.) is **1.305** for the pre-assessment and **1.607** for the post-assessment. As shown in the Table (5) the first hypothesis was accepted**.** ", where t= **10.273**, p<0.01 which is statistically significant at 0.01.

**4.1.2. Findings of the fifth hypothesis:**

The fifth hypothesis states that "there is a statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the participants in the pre- and post-assessment of overall EFL creative writing skills in favour of the post-assessment ."

 For testing this hypothesis, the one sample T-test was used to compare the mean scores of the participants in overall EFL creative writing skills on the pre- and the post administration of EFL creative writing test. Table (7) presents the mean scores, standard deviation and level of the significance in the pre- and post-assessment of overall EFL creative writing

**Table 7 : T-test differences between the participants' mean scores in the pre- and post-assessment of overall EFL creative writing**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Skill** | **Assessment** | **N.** | **Mean** | **S.D.** | **T-Value** | **D.F** | **Sig.** |
| **overall EFL creative writing**  | **Pre-** | **36** | **29.500** | **4.191** | **17.432** | **35** | **0.01** |
| **Post-** | **36** | **40.722** | **3.932** |

 This table shows that the mean scores are **29.500** for the pre-assessment and **40.722** for the post-assessment. The standard deviation (S.D.) is **4.191** for the pre-assessment and **3.932** for the post-assessment. As shown in the Table (6) the fifth hypothesis was accepted**.** ", where t= **17.432**, p<0.01 which is statistically significant at 0.01.

**4.1.2. Findings of the sixth hypothesis:**

The sixth hypothesis states that "there is a statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the participants in the pre- and post-assessment of overall EFL self-efficacy in favour of the post-assessment ."

 For testing this hypothesis, the one sample T-test was used to compare the mean scores of the participants in EFL self-efficacy on the pre- and the post administration of EFL self-efficacy scale . Table (8) presents the mean scores, standard deviation and level of the significance in the pre- and post-assessment of overall EFL self-efficacy

**Table 8 : T-test differences between the participants' mean scores in the pre- and post-assessment of EFL self-efficacy**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Item** | **Assessment** | **N.** | **Mean** | **S.D.** | **T-Value** | **D.F** | **Sig.** |
| **EFL self-efficacy**  | **Pre-** | **36** | **44.361** | **12.633** | **9.433** | **35** | **0.01** |
| **Post-** | **36** | **55.694** | **13.369** |

 This table shows that the mean scores are **44.361** for the pre-assessment and **55.694** for the post-assessment. The standard deviation (S.D.) is **12.633** for the pre-assessment and **13.369** for the post-assessment. As shown in the Table (6) the sixth hypothesis was accepted**.** ", where t= **9.433**, p<0.01 which is statistically significant at 0.01.

**8- Discussion and Interpretation of the study Findings:**

This part is concerned with the interpretation and discussion of the previously mentioned findings tackled in the previous section of the research. The findings are interpreted and discussed in the light of the study hypotheses.

Concerning the first hypothesis, the findings revealed that there was a statistically significant difference between the participants' mean scores in the pre- and post-assessment of EFL writing fluency skill in favour of the post-assessment as T-value was 16.823 which is significant at 0.01. This means that the participants achieved more improvement in their writing fluency skills. This result confirmed the first hypothesis statistically.

The (OCLT) based program has proved to be effective in developing the participants' EFL writing fluency. This development can be attributed to various factors. The researcher used authentic and comprehensible input to develop students' writing skills. She invoked students' interest and curiosity about the target skill. Getting different kinds of feedback from peers during the writing process was positively received by most of students, and Google Docs makes this process easy. Moreover, through the sessions some students noted that reading and editing others’ writing was an even more helpful activity for them than receiving the feedback that was consistent with (Schunn, et al., 2016).

 The results may be attributed also to Padlet that supports collaborative learning. It was used through the sessions to communicate, brainstorm, and also giving opinions on Padlet group. The participants explained that they used Padet to discuss together about a problem. It can make students learn to give a critical thinking about a problem especially when they learn to write with a topic. In writing improvement, collaborative learning assisted students to enhance writing through project work like giving a picture for students in learning activity and gathering information about it that may develop their fluency in writing skills and generate large numbers of ideas. They gained some ideas for making an essay after they shared and discussed together with their friends in a flow manner of language properly to show the logical sequence of related ideas.

**Concerning the second hypothesis**, the findings revealed that there was a statistically significant difference between the participants' mean scores in the pre- and post-assessment of EFL writing flexibility skill in favour of the post-assessment as T-value was 10.841 which is significant at 0.01. This means that the participants achieved more improvement in their writing flexibility skills. This result confirmed the second hypothesis statistically.

Google Docs develops students' flexibility in writing as it provides the capacity to leave *Comments* and *Suggestions* in the margins of documents, allowing students to interact more quickly and conveniently than if they were writing on paper or using other word-processing programs. The research shows that these comments and suggestions can be beneficial for both the students giving the feedback and the students receiving the feedback. Students develop their ability to generate flow of ideas in different ways and linguistic pattern. They also practiced through the sessions how to have a wide variety of ideas and to practice how to redefine problems by making more concrete and abstract of ideas when necessary.

Throughout the research, students expressed their appreciation for receiving quality feedback from their peers. showed that the process of giving comments to others during peer-editing was beneficial for the commenter as well as the original writer ( the researcher). When a reciprocal process like this is formed, such as when two students share their individual Google Docs with each other for feedback, both students benefit, that was consistent with Zheng, et al., (2015)

Padlet facilitates participants' feedback. Participants revealed that feedback helps them to maximize their potential at different stages of training, increase the awareness of strength for improvement. This is in line with Bijami, Kashef and Nejad (2013) who asserted that students can learn more about feedback by reading their writing draft and they are aware what makes writing successful and effective to be enriched. Moreover, it means that gaining feedback makes students evaluate and revise their own writing and their writing ability will be increased directly after getting feedback .

**Concerning the third hypothesis,** the findings revealed that there was a statistically significant difference between the participants' mean scores in the pre- and post-assessment of EFL writing accuracy skill in favour of the post-assessment as T-value was 7.165 which is significant at 0.01. This means that the participants achieved more improvement in their writing accuracy skills. This result confirmed the third hypothesis statistically

The researcher provides synchronous online feedback during the writing process was more helpful than providing asynchronous feedback in helping students learn how to fix grammar errors. For instance, this type of activity may involve the teacher and student both bringing up the document on each of their screens during class time; the teacher could be giving feedback to the student on the document and the student could be resolving it instantly, and the two could be having a verbal conversation about these edits as they take place , that was consistent with Shintani and Aubrey (2016) .

The researcher leaves comments in the margins of a document that students can see in real time or read and resolve later. She can also change the document to *Suggesting Mode* and leave colored edits on a document that the students identify their grammar errors and understand the fixes as they edit. Teacher interactions of this nature during the writing process proved helpful for students in the studies mentioned above

The researcher found students tended to have positive perceptions when reading their written work aloud to themselves as a way to check for consistency and view the work in a different way. Although this has not been studied much, Google’s *Read & Write* Chrome extension offers a unique opportunity for students to use this strategy with their writing. The *Text-to-Speech* (TTS) function, which reads written work aloud from the device’s speakers, could be used by students to listen to their writing being read to them by the software to help them find errors that they may not have noticed if they had simply read the work over again silently. *Practice Reading Aloud* is a second feature that used by the participants to read their written work aloud into the device’s microphone while the Read & Write extension records them. They can later replay this

Truly, Google Docs does provide simple ways for identifying some grammar fixes, which is probably why so many student writers hone in on these small edits. Anyone who has spent any time on a word-processor is familiar with that red squiggly line that appears under a mistake in Google Docs. Docs also has a spell-checker tool that takes

the writer through each spelling error in a document one at a time and offers suggested

corrections.

The researcher noticed that the participants support for Padlet as a platform to increase English vocabulary. They admitted that Padlet can improve vocabulary that they never heard before. This is in line with Salehi & Dehkrodi (2016), who asserted that vocabulary is a key element of English proficiency serving as building for writing. Vocabulary can be described as input and writing is output.

**Concerning the fourth hypothesis**, the findings revealed that there was a statistically significant difference between the participants' mean scores in the pre- and post-assessment of EFL writing originality skill in favour of the post-assessment as T-value was 10.273 which is significant at 0.01. This means that the participants achieved more improvement in their writing originality skills. This result confirmed the fourth hypothesis statistically

Google Docs makes the originality in writing accessible because a student can simply press the “Share” button and type in the names of their peer-editors, who will then instantly have access to the document. In these ways, the researcher establish specific roles for students in order to improve the peer-editing activities and their ability to generate a truly unique ideas or to write a new solution to a specific problem through the sessions' practice writing She also, assigned rotating roles to the participants through the sessions during peer-editing and holds them accountable for their responsibilities as peer-editors in order to achieve the best results.

Regarding Padlet, it provides opportunities to learners and their instructor to communicate in a new solution for specific problem whenever they want. When they interact with each other to do different tasks or to discuss a particular topic, unlike face-to-face interaction, they have time to think, to correct their mistakes and to equally comment; that is, this can enhance their writing proficiency, originality and composition ability. Moreover, the researcher used authentic writing tasks often involve giving students real-world writing prompts or assignments. This often motivates them to write better, become more cognizant of their mistakes and remind them to fix them, keep them invested in what they are writing.

Concerning the fifth hypothesis, the findings revealed that there was a statistically significant difference between the participants' mean scores in the pre- and post-assessment of overall EFL creative writing skill in favour of the post-assessment as T-value was 17.433 which is significant at 0.01. This means that the participants achieved more improvement in their overall creative writing skills. This result confirmed the fifth hypothesis statistically.

Based on the students’ scores from all tests, the content aspect had improved. It was shown by the ability students in developing their creative writing skills and self efficacy. Their idea was relevant with the title. The students’ writing was understandable, showed knowledge of subject. The students were able explore the idea easily. There was good elaboration in their writing. By using Google Docs, students were able to develop the idea easily. They could discuss the topic being developed with other students in online way.

Through the sessions of the program, Google Docs allows more than one person to work on a particular document at the same time. While states that Google docs has "research tool". The most impressive Google Docs writing support is an integrated research tool that’s available right on the page. Useful content specific buttons allow students to insert links, images, maps, and citations into a document with the click of a button. Students can narrow a search to find only images, scholarly information and quotations. This powerful research tool provides students with convenient access to information in manageable chunks that are ready for use. By using Google Docs through the sessions practice, students could develop the idea easily. They could find the information to develop their idea from many sources that was consistent with Walsh (2010) & Susan (2012) and Zheng, et al., (2015).

Concerning the sixth hypothesis, the findings revealed that there was a statistically significant difference between the participants' mean scores in the pre- and post-assessment of EFL self- efficacy scale in favour of the post-assessment as T-value was 9.433 which is significant at 0.01. This means that the participants achieved more improvement in their self-efficacy dimensions. This result confirmed the sixth hypothesis statistically.

Feedback from the teacher and help during the writing process, especially through the use of technology, can help build confidence within student writers and inspire growth mindsets about revision. motivate students to revise to help them see the errors or problems in their writing and care about changing them and new technologies offer a way to do just that. Through the practice sessions Google Docs tool makes the revision process easier and more transparent with student and develop their motivation and interest. Moreover, the revision history, wherein users can see previous versions of documents with the changes that were made appearing in a bright color. This was particularly motivating for the participants that was consistent with Suwantarathip and Wichadee’s (2014) .

When participating in a collaborative revision activity, the students reported feeling that their opinions were worthwhile and helpful to their partners and that the activity was reciprocal in that they felt their own writing was improved as well. Students in general tend to enjoy working with each other.They were enthusiastic about their collaborativewriting task, were more focused throughout the writing process, and produced better writingproducts on Google Docs. that was consistent with Hanjani (2015)

During the program sessions ( practicing Google docs and padlet) , the students performed collaborative revision with their self-selected partners. All of the participants felt positively about the collaborative process and how it affected their English writing skills. Several students noted that the collaboration made the revision process easier and more accurate, enhanced their motivation when their partners recognized their writing strengths, and boosted their confidence in writing. Participants also said that having a partner helped make them feel better about the process, parse out the comments from the instructor, and lowered their stress level, that was consistent with Moonen (2015)

**9- Conclusion:**

The results of the study asserted that the participants' creative writing skills was developed and their self-efficacy was enhanced through the implementation of the suggested program. The implications from the findings of this study support that Google Docs and padlet are useful tools that make online learning environment possible. Language learners can gain knowledge in a democratic and relaxing atmosphere where they can judge whether the mistakes should be corrected and learn to accept the comments from others. This is very different from the conventional teacher feedback pedagogy which does not provide any choices for learners.

While the Google Docs and padlet for Education are certainly not the only digital tools available to student writers, they provide unique learning opportunities that, when done effectively, can vastly improve students’ writing. The findings of this literature review provide interesting conclusions and recommendations for classroom teachers and researchers interested in the integration of technology, especially Google tools, in writing instruction.

In its simplest form, peer-editing should help students by giving them another pair of

eyes to look over their writing for errors and overall clarity. Many students felt positive about receiving this help (Brodahl & Hansen, 2014) and believed that collaboration results in better writing overall because of the feedback and constructive criticism they received (Blau & Caspi, 2009). Students often understand the necessity for peer-editing and do not feel that their writing is violated when their peers give them suggestions (Suwantarathip & Wichadee,2014).

**10- Recommendations of the study:**

The results of the research offer a number of recommendations for classroom teachers

looking to improve their writing instruction, as follows:

- English language teachers should be trained on using different other types of online collaborative tools in EFL writing skills.

- EFL student teachers should practice online collaborative learning tools.

- Curriculum designers must take into their account the importance of embedding online learning tools in the syllables of different stages.

**11- Suggestions for further Research:**

Within the limitations of the present study as well as the findings being achieved, the following areas are suggested for further research:

1- Using (OCLT) to develop student teachers' linguistic competence.

2- Using (OCLT) to develop oral communication skills among EFL student teachers.

3- Developing other language skills among EFL student teachers such as listening through (OCLT).

:
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